

A
 REVIEW
 OF THE
 STATE
 OF THE
 BRITISH NATION.

Thursday, December 23. 1708.

WE are now come from the Discourse of Persecution abroad, to an Invitation to Persecution at home; and it would be wonder'd, if the Man was not at home, where he is known; what the Author of the *Rehearsal* means in his last Paper, N^o.... where he makes an Excursion from his old Antagonists, the *Presbyterians* or *Dissenters*, and in his Turn flies in the Face of the Church of *England*; and maintaining a Thesis, which in its Appearance has something in it new, and looks insulting on the Government, seems to make us believe, he is prompting them to prosecute him, and with a great Deal of Church Bravery bids Defiance to the Government, tells them he is ready for Martyrdom, and bids them fall on when they will.

His Words are very plain and assuming in his Paper of *Saturday, Dec. 18*. Thus,
 " To provoke these Infidels the more,
 " and to give them all the Handle (as they
 " think) of the Law against me, I do here
 " give it under my Hand, and will main-
 " tain it before the *Queen* and *Parliament*,
 " (if they require me) That it is not in
 " their Power, and of all the *People of Bri-*
 " *tain* with them, to make a *Bishop* or a
 " *Priest*. And that if they should destroy
 " all the *Bishops* in *Britain* and *Ireland*; and
 " require us to live without *Bishops*, I would
 " not obey them, but seek for *Bishops* where
 " I could get them, and with them endure
 " all the *Persecution* it should please *GOD* to
 " permit all the *Powers* on the Earth to lay
 " upon us. *Persecution* is no new Thing to
 " the

the Church. And under Christian Princes
 "as well as Heathen. And often more se-
 "vere from the Former than the Latter.
 "For the Wounds of a Friend are deeper
 "than of an Enemy."

It was indeed Time for the *Rebearsal* to quit the Story of the Persecution in *Scotland*, and to bring in something to put by the Necessity he was under, of acknowledging the scandalous Characters of the quallify'd Ministers he mentions, and now the poor *Jacobites* in *Scotland* may have some Rest; for certainly this Clamour makes the Proceeding against them more and more necessary every day.

Now, who the *Rebearsal* expects should debate with him the Point, he has now taken up, I know not; the *Observer*, he says, owns himself a *Presbyterian*, and we all know is such; and for the *Review*, he, any more than the *Observer*, will never debate with him about who CANNOT make a Bishop——If he was going to prove who CAN, perhaps we might dissent more plainly from him——Nor shall I offer here at telling him, how naturally this returns him to the supream Power of the Church, and a modern Popery——But this I shall tell him of my self.

That he need not challenge the Government to prosecute him, nor expect the Crown of Martyrdom upon the Subject; for unless the Government correct him for his Sauciness, and insulting them, as to Matters of Law——*In which he has so far experienc'd the publick Lenity that he PRESUMES:* I say, unless they proceed with him this way, he has so cunningly worded his Affirmation, that it is just nothing at all but a meer Rhodomontade——And affirming nothing but what with a double Entendre he may represent, which way he pleases.

That the Queen or Parliament cannot MAKE a Bishop or a Priest; here any Body that has any Eyes in their Understandings may see the Jesuitical Turn——The Question lies plain, what does he mean by MAKE? The Queen's Writ goes down to the Dean, and Chapter licensing them to elect——And the Title of the Writ is sufficient without repeating the Form. *Conge d'Esire*, 'tis a French Term, a Writ giving them Leave to

elect such a Person. Now, tho' this Writ does imply, they have not Leave given them to elect another, and that without Leave they cannot elect another; yet the Church at the same time that they gave up this Article to the Supremacy of the Crown, gave it with such a Kind of a Reserve, that tho' they gave up the Substance, they seem'd to reserve the Form——Now tho' in common Acceptation, nominating the Person is MAKING the Bishop, yet in Strictness of Sense, it is the Consecration makes the Bishop, not the Nomination; and there our new Confessor will creep out; for in this Sense the Queen makes no Bishops, any more than she ordains a Priest.

Had the *Rebearsal* said the Queen, or the Queen and Parliament had not a Right to nominate the Person——Or that the Dean and Chapter had a Right to chuse whom they pleas'd without her Majesty's Leave——Then indeed he might have had some Reason to prepare for the Sufferings he speaks of, as having deny'd the Queen that Authority which the Laws of the Land has vested in the Crown, and that supreme Government which the Canons of the Church of England have acknowledg'd and censur'd the Opposers of. *Can. 11.* says expressly, *Whosoever shall impeach any Part of the Kings Regal Supremacy by the Laws of this Realm restor'd to, and establish'd in the Crown, let him be excommunicated IPSO FACTO, &c.*

Thus all his Bluster has nothing but an empty Noise in it; and if he would have us to understand any less Power to be in the Queen and Parliament about the making a Bishop or a Priest, than the Laws of England has appointed, he must say so in plainer Words; for it is already certain, the Queen consecrates no Bishops, nor ordains any Priests, but the Queen names whom the Church shall consecrate, and they cannot by the Laws of this Realm consecrate any other, nor can they consecrate any at all without her Nomination; and thus far the Queen makes a Bishop; and if he will deny this to be lawful, let him do it when he pleases, he will easily be confuted.

Two more Things I must take Notice of in this Anti-Church of *England* Paper, for such I think it may be well call'd, since he assumes Things in it contrary to the very Principles as well as Practice of the Church of *England*—And which plainly tend to overthrow her Doctrine as well as Establishment.

1. His unjust Raillery on the *Presbyterian* Ministers in *Scotland*, for omitting to baptize a Child, till the Time appointed by the Order of the Church—Tho' the Child was at the Point of Death—Now his Quarrel, at this has these two Consequences in it, which I say, directly oppose the Church of *England*.

1. The 34th Article of the Church of *England* says, That every Particular or National Church hath Authority to ordain, change and abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordain'd only by Man's Authority. Now if the Church of *Scotland* has appointed Baptism to be administered openly and only in the Church—It is a just Appointment by the Acknowledgment of this 34th Article, and ought to be observ'd; and whether private Baptisms are to be commended rather than publick, I leave to the Ministers of the Church or Dissenters here to determine, both which I have heard complain of it—If then the Church have Power to appoint it to be done in the Church, they have also Power to prescribe the Time of it; and if that Time be to be alter'd in any private Case, the Worship of GOD would upon frequent Occasions be disturb'd; and a Parent in Case of Danger, if the Child should come into the Church in the middle of the Sermon, and demand of the Minister to break off, and interrupt the whole Work of the Day to baptize a Child—And yet I can say this of my own Knowledge, that I have observ'd a Minister to hasten and shorten his Sermon, and after that to shorten the very Office of Baptism it self, in Case of the Extremity of the Child, and the Child

was baptiz'd Living, but in a very little Time expir'd.

But 2. The Exclamation of this Author seems to be built upon that exploded Doctrine of Baptism, being a regenerating Ordinance, and that the Soul of an Infant dying without Baptism is lost by that meer Omission—Who they are that dare put that Weight upon the outward Performance, as to bind down the Salvation of the Infant to the outward Act, and so put it into the Parents Power to save or damn their Infant Children, I have nothing to do to examine; but am sure, there is nothing of it to be seen in the Scripture, nor in the Article of the Church of *England*, which says thus—

Baptism is a Sign of Regeneration or New-Birth, whereby as by an Instrument they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the Promises of the Forgiveness of Sin, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of GOD by the Holy Ghost are visibly sign'd and seal'd.

Article XXVII.—How they will make the Sign of the Thing pass for the Thing it self, remains to be prov'd; and therefore when as he says, the Ministers of *Scotland* took care to preach up the No-Necessity of Baptism—He ought to have explain'd that No-Necessity, if he means they preach'd, That it was not the Duty of every Christian Parent to present his Children to God, dedicate them to him in entring them into the Church in Baptism, he is a Slanderer, and the Truth is not in him—But if he means, that they might for Ease of the doubting and unsatisfy'd Parent explain, how far that Necessity went, and how far not, and let the People know, that the Salvation of the Souls of our Children is not positively annex'd to the outward Institution, they did nothing but what the Church of *England* and all